

5012
8867193P

AN OPEN LETTER,

ADDRESSED BY

HON. OLIVER MOWAT

TO

REV. G. M. MILLIGAN.

29th October, 1886.

PROTESTANTISM NOT IN DANGER.

THE PREMIER VINDICATES HIS GOVERNMENT.

A review of matters lately in controversy.

Toronto:

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY.

1886.

AN OPEN LETTER

ADDRESSED BY

HON. OLIVER MOWAT

TO

REV. G. M. MILLIGAN.



(From the Globe.)

Hon. Mr. Mowat has addressed the following letter to Rev G. M. Milligan :—

REV. G. M. MILLIGAN, B.A.,
*Minister of Old St. Andrew's Church,
Toronto.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I cordially recognize the friendly spirit in which your recently published letters were written. I am glad to know from these letters and otherwise that, as regards your own political creed, you are a Liberal, and that you have been an outspoken Liberal; and I unreservedly accept what you say as to your object in writing having been to strengthen my hands by furnishing me with evidence to which (if necessary) I could point any of my colleagues who might counsel the granting of favours on account of religion. Though neither Mr. Macdonnell nor Mr. McLeod states this friendly purpose to be the object of their letters, yet as Mr. Macdonnell, though a Conservative, is said to have voted for a supporter of the present Ontario Government at the last general election, and as Mr. McLeod has always been understood to be a Liberal like yourself, I am satisfied that the letter of neither was written with any adverse political design. But I presume you have observed that all three letters have been made use of by the Conservative press

TO INJURE THE LIBERAL PARTY

at the coming elections, and thereby, as you and I believe, to injure the Province; and as the letters indicate the impressions of three justly esteemed ministers of our Church, they may naturally be expected to have more or less the effect which our political opponents desire. I therefore feel it my duty to make a personal statement of the facts bearing on the matters to which the letters refer; and I do so in the present form, rather than by a speech at one of the great Reform gatherings which are taking place in different parts of the Province, because I have been advised, in consequence of my recent recovery from a second somewhat severe illness, to avoid for a time speaking at public meetings.

All three letters express an apprehension that the Church of Rome has an undue and injurious influence with the present Ontario Government, and that unwarrantable interferences by the Roman Catholic clergy have been permitted; and you all refer to certain transactions at, or in relation to, the Central Prison as affording examples of this influence and illustrations of its danger. The *Presbyterian Review* has had a number of articles on the same subject, written, however, in a very different spirit from the letters. These articles greatly enlarge the indictment, and manifest a strong animus against the Government and a strong desire to do us all the harm possible. I shall show you the injustice of those articles, and shall show you some of the errors into which (I say with great respect) you have all fallen, and but for which I am sure that the letters would not have been written.

As a Protestant, I heartily recognize the reasonableness, and the duty, of your taking an active interest in preventing injurious concessions to the "Romish hierarchy," or to any other hierarchy, or to any other body, and also in resisting any undue influence or unwarrantable interference. But I emphatically and unequivocally affirm that, as regards the present Ontario Government, there have been no such concessions as have been suggested and no such influence; and that there is no danger of anything of the kind as long as that Government is constituted as it is now; every statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

Before going into any details let me observe, that

THE POLICY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY,

as I have always understood it, is, to be just to Roman Catholics, and to be unjust to none. There may be an honest difference of opinion as to what justice requires or warrants; but our views on that subject, and our practice in carrying them out, are now what they have been always, and they have hitherto received as large

a measure of public approval as a Government could look for. It has been my good fortune, with the assistance of able colleagues and Liberal supporters, so to conduct the Government and guide the Legislation of this Province during the last fourteen years as to have had during this period the entire confidence of the Liberal party, and to a large extent the approval of intelligent Conservatives also; and, as a consequence, it is notorious that, in regard to the general election which is now approaching, the Opposition are hopeless of success from ordinary methods. But in a community so largely Protestant as ours, the cry of "Protestantism in danger," if the people can be got to believe it, may overpower all other issues. Accordingly, in the extremity of the Conservative opposition, and for the sole purpose of getting votes, the leading Conservative organ here began some months ago to cry "No Popery;" the Conservative press generally took up the cry; and all these journals have ever since persistently endeavoured to create the belief, or the fear, that new and objectionable legislation in the interest of the Roman Catholic portion of the people is contemplated, and that new and peculiar privileges or advantages are intended to be given to them. But all this I am in a position to positively and emphatically deny. Nothing of the kind has ever been under our consideration; or been from any quarter proposed or suggested for our consideration; and I have not the slightest reason for supposing that anything of the kind has been thought of by any of my colleagues, or (I ought in justice to add) by any Roman Catholic authority. I do not doubt that,

AS A LIBERAL AND A PROTESTANT,

you will be glad of this statement of mine, and that any other Protestant Liberals, who from any cause have been led to believe or apprehend that the case was otherwise, will feel glad to have their confidence strengthened. They know that I have never deceived them hitherto. They and you will justly believe that I do not deceive now.

You refer to our civil and religious liberties as being in danger, or possible danger. I take as deep an interest in the liberties, civil and religious, of my native Province as any man can. Office is no advantage to me, involving as it does pecuniary loss, unceasing and exhausting labour, continual misrepresentation and abuse by political opponents, and occasionally, as in the present case, misunderstandings on the part of friends. If office did not afford the opportunity of doing good service to my Province, or if power could only be maintained by submitting to undue and pernicious influence of any kind, I could not endure my position for a day. One of the advantages of that position is, that it enables me to

know whether and when there is danger of the kind which you and some others apprehend, and should it arise to avert it.

THE "PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW."

I did not see the *Review* articles when they appeared, having been ill when the first of them was published, and having afterwards been for a considerable time absent from the Province; but within the last few days a friend has collected them for me. Speaking for the *Review*, the writer repeatedly disclaims any political leanings, but I have no doubt, from these articles, that he has political leanings, and very strong ones. The manager is well known to be a pronounced Conservative.

THE CENTRAL PRISON—THE COMMISSION.

The first article was (I presume) that which appeared in the *Review* of the 22nd July. In that article the writer finds evidence of Romish influence with the Government, even in the issuing of a Commission for inquiring into the charges which had been made against the Warden, and which the Conservative press had for months before been parading before the public. He says: "The Government yielded to the pressure [it is of Roman Catholic pressure he is speaking] so far as to nominate a Commission." Yet a Commission is the ordinary way of dealing with complaints which cannot be set at rest by the action of the Inspectors. In this case, besides, it was the repeatedly expressed desire of the Warden that a Commission should be issued; he thought that a public investigation by a Commission would afford a sure means, and the best means, of exculpating him from the charges against him.

I have no doubt that the agitation against the Warden was raised by Roman Catholics who were unfriendly to the Government; and being so raised, it was taken advantage of, by our political opponents generally, to injure the Warden whom we had appointed, and to injure the Government whose officer he is. The *Review* writer ascribes the agitation to Roman Catholic prisoners being permitted to attend the Protestant Sunday School; and the same thing is said in Mr. McLeod's letter. I do not remember hearing of this before reading that letter. The matter was not brought to the attention of the Government by either party, nor to that of the Provincial Secretary, as he informs me. I understand the rule for all our Provincial institutions to have always been, before my time and still, that the Protestant inmates shall receive their religious instruction from Protestant teachers, and the Roman Catholic inmates from Roman Catholic teachers; and, on

the other hand, that Protestant prisoners shall not receive Roman Catholic instruction, nor Roman Catholics Protestant instruction. Reference to the Inspector's reports for 1878 and 1879 shows that in the Central Prison the rule had not been carried out in those years. In the report for 1878 the Inspector said :—

“ Respecting all these services, it was noticed that a considerable number of prisoners classed as Protestants attended the Roman Catholic service in the morning, and that many Roman Catholic prisoners were at both the Protestant school and service. Such attendance is entirely voluntary on the part of the prisoners, and, so far, no complaint has been made by any of the teachers or clergy. It is evident, however, that circumstances might arise through this practice, upon which charges of proselytism might be based. To avoid all ground for this, the Warden is instructed to give orders to allow the Protestant and Roman Catholic prisoners to only attend the services and schools of their respective denominations ; more particularly as the practice of attending the services is apparently followed more for the purpose of relieving the monotony of cell life for a time than for that of receiving instruction on each occasion.”

There is a similar paragraph in the report for the following year.

I think that, on the whole, the rule thus stated is a good one. The chance (so to speak) of the conversion of a Roman Catholic convict to Protestantism is too slight, humanly speaking, to be taken into account as against the evils which facilities for proselytism would create. Good, happily, is sometimes done among the Protestant prisoners by Protestant teachers, and among the Roman Catholic prisoners by the Roman Catholic teachers ; and it does seem well that the efforts of each class of teachers should be confined to the prisoners of their own religion ; this work is quite wide enough without Protestant prisoners being received at the Roman Catholic Sunday School, or Roman Catholic prisoners at the Protestant Sunday School. Any other system would be a new departure which, I venture to say, would, on reflection, be as distasteful to Protestants as to Roman Catholics. Outside of the prison walls all may go to any church or Sunday School they choose ; but how many Roman Catholics of the same class outside of the prison have in Toronto become Protestants, so far as you know or have heard of ? There could be no harmony or peace in any of our institutions if proselytism were permitted on either side ; and any one who would be of service

IN GOVERNING A MIXED COMMUNITY

like ours must be broad-minded enough to recognize the consequent necessities of prison management, however strong his own views

of religious truth may be. The commissioners also were of that opinion. They expressly recommended in their report "that Catholics and Protestants be compelled to go to their own service, and be prevented from going to any other, unless with the written consent of the clergyman of whom they are in charge."

It may be correct that the Warden's action in this matter (whatever it was) had something to do with the agitation against him; but from what I now know, I have little doubt that the agitation originated with certain ill-conducted prisoners and certain mischief-makers amongst the guards. They fomented hostility amongst Roman Catholic prisoners and Roman Catholic officers; guards and prisoners invented stories against the Warden; they gave a false colouring to acts of his which involved no wrong; they told their falsehoods to newspaper men, and to Roman Catholic clergymen who attended the prison and whose hostility they desired thereby to excite or stimulate. While the agitation was going on, the Warden made no complaint to me, and I know from the Provincial Secretary, the Minister to whose Department the charge of the Central Prison belongs, that no complaint was made to his department, except in the case of the Rev. Father Jeffcot. That complaint was transmitted to the Archbishop for his information. His Grace thereupon appointed another priest in the place of the Rev. Father Jeffcot. You are aware that the clergymen who attend, whether Protestant or Catholic, are not appointed or paid by the Government. The Warden has stated in one of his published letters that the priest who now attends has made himself acceptable to all the officers of the prison, not excluding the Warden himself.

MEANWHILE LETTERS AND EDITORIALS APPEARED

in both the Conservative and Independent journals of the city, setting forth in detail a variety of charges against the Warden, such as gross cruelty to the prisoners, and especially to Roman Catholic prisoners, and "unwarrantable interferences" with the religious duties of Roman Catholics. These charges were by many Roman Catholics, as well as by some Protestants, believed to be true. One of our inspectors investigated them, and satisfied himself that they were not true; and the Government was of the same opinion. But the managers of the Conservative press insisted on the absolute necessity of a Commission, and with more reason than often belongs to what is found in their columns. Thus, in the *Mail* of the 20th March, 1885, the following language was used:—

"The Government cannot afford to ignore this awful arraignment of the Warden and his subordinates, even though they know it to be false; and we

assume that a Commission of Inquiry will at once be appointed and empowered to act altogether independently of the Government or Government Inspector, one or both of whom are necessarily in the same boat with the gaol officials."

Much more to the same effect appeared in that journal and in other journals of its party.

It was suspected, but could not be definitely ascertained or established, that the newspapers had some of their information from mischief-makers in the prison, who communicated it secretly. This was afterwards proved to be the case in respect of two of the guards; and both were at once dismissed. It was known that one Roman Catholic clergyman, a Conservative, and then and still an outspoken opponent of the Government, openly exerted himself to bring the charges before the public through Mr. Meredith and otherwise.

AFTER THE NEWSPAPER ARTICLES HAD

begun to appear, I had two short interviews—I do not recollect more—with the Archbishop. I have reason to believe that none of my colleagues had any communication with him on the subject of the Central Prison. No Liberal will think it wrong to have seen the Archbishop in reference to the complaints of his people. It is part of my duty, and it is my constant practice, to have such interviews with persons, high and low, who have complaints to make, or who are interested in the complaints of others, or who desire to call my attention to any matters with which the Provincial Government or Legislature has to do. In this way I have had interviews with Protestant bishops, and with Protestant clergymen of all denominations, with prohibitionists and with anti-prohibitionists, with promoters and opponents of railway and other projects, with mechanics and labourers, with merchants and traders, with doctors and lawyers, with farmers, with educationists, and with representatives of many other classes of the community. With Protestant clergymen I have had many times more interviews in my public capacity than I have had with clergymen of the Roman Catholic Church, the Archbishop included.

IN THE FIRST OF MY TWO INTERVIEWS

with His Grace he referred to these newspaper articles, and expressed a wish that I should personally examine into the charges contained in them. I could not deny—no one could or will deny—that if the charges were true, the Warden could not be retained in his position, but I observed that I could not believe

them to be true. I am bound to say that His Grace did not manifest any hostile feeling at either interview, or on any other occasion, against the Warden. I surely need not say that if the Warden had been a Roman Catholic, and had been charged with misconduct towards Protestants, there is not a Protestant worthy of the name who would not desire the Warden's removal in case the facts were as charged.

Subsequently, the Conservative leader in the Ontario Assembly, at the instance of certain Roman Catholic and other political supporters, took the responsibility of bringing the subject before the House. He did this several times.

The following is the *Mail's* report (18th March, 1885) of what he said on one of these occasions :

“ Since the recent discussion on the Central Prison he had been given to understand that prisoners were often kept in the cells for ten days on bread and water. He pressed upon the Government the necessity of acceding to the public demand for an investigation.”

Next day he referred to the same subject in the following terms :

“ He had particulars of the cases he referred to last night in the Central Prison. A prisoner named O'Neil was confined in a dark cell seventy-two hours and kept on bread and water three months, after which he was declared insane. Another prisoner was kept twenty-four hours on bread and water, and afterwards was declared partially insane. There were nine or ten such cases with similar treatment, and he thought that in the public interest there should be a public investigation.”

The next day he returned to the same subject, and the following are extracts from the *Mail's* report of the introductory part of his speech :

“ In the Legislature on Wednesday night Mr. Meredith rose upon the motion to adjourn, and drew the attention of the Ministry to the reported acts of cruelty in the Central Prison. He had been supplied with information regarding them, and in view of the particulars furnished he thought it in the public interest, and in the interest of the Warden, that a public and full investigation should be held. A prisoner named O'Neil had been kept in a dark cell seventy-two hours, and kept three and one-half months on bread and water, without a bed. When released and set to work O'Neil was so weak that he could not stand up to work, and upon examination he was declared to be insane.”

He then proceeded to detail other cases of frightful and wanton cruelty.

In a subsequent number of the *Mail* (March 30, 1885) the following report is given of what took place when I announced to the House the decision of the Government:

“Hon. Mr. Mowat said that the item of supply for the Central Prison had stood in order that information might be furnished the member for London as to the truth of certain charges or rumours. The Government had come to the conclusion that there was no foundation for the charges. At the same time they had decided it to be expedient that the charges should be investigated, and a thorough investigation would be made by one of the judges; Warden Massie was anxious to have such an investigation. Mr. Meredith said that no one would be more pleased than he if the result of the investigation vindicated the Warden from the charges made. He urged that an assurance should be given to those employed within the walls of the prison that they would be held harmless if they gave their evidence openly and without fear. Only upon this understanding would the investigation be of any value. Hon. Mr. Mowat said they would do what was possible to enable the men to speak fearlessly and truthfully.”

THE “PERSONNEL” OF THE COMMISSION.

I find that on the subject of the Commission afterwards issued, the *Review* writer has this further story, of somebody’s imagining, to tell. He says that “when the Commission was named the priesthood protested against its *personnel*.” There was no such protest. In the second of my two interviews with the Archbishop, and before the *personnel* had been decided upon in Council, I mentioned to him my notion of appointing two Commissioners only; both were Protestants. The Archbishop made no “protest” against the Commission being issued to the two, and them only. On the contrary, he said that he himself would have perfect confidence in a Commission to these gentlemen alone, but he suggested that the Commission would give greater confidence to some of his people, and any report they might make would be more generally acquiesced in, if I should add the name of some Roman Catholic gentleman, anyone I should myself select. The suggestion seemed to me reasonable and wise. On my reporting it to my colleagues they took the same view. We then considered in Council several names, and ultimately Mr. O’Sullivan was selected as being a fair man, a man of ability and good standing, and having personally the confidence of his co-religionists, Conservative and Liberal.

FROM THAT DAY TO THIS

I do not remember having heard a suggestion that the appoint-

ment on the Commission of one Roman Catholic was wrong, or that a better appointment than that of Mr. O'Sullivan could have been made. Must every suggestion of a Roman Catholic be rejected, whether it is reasonable or unreasonable? That is not my view of a public man's duty. If the complaining parties had been Protestants, and the Warden a Catholic, would my fellow-Protestants have thought it reasonable or just that the Commission should go to two Catholics, and that the suggestion to add a Protestant should be rejected? He would be an odd sort of Protestant who would say so or think so. All the story about the protesting of the priesthood is imagination or invention. I had no word on the subject from or with any priest or Roman Catholic, except the Archbishop; and none with the Archbishop beyond what I have mentioned; and the whole matter was conducted by myself personally, until I brought it before Council as stated. The other Commissioners appointed were Judge Sinclair, of Hamilton, a member of the Church of England, and Mr. Langmuir, of Toronto, an expert in prison management, and a Presbyterian.

THE HOSTILE ATTITUDE OF THE "MAIL."

After the prorogation, and before the Commissioners began their labours, the *Mail* newspaper and other journals affected impatience at the delay in commencing, and hinted that the Government was delaying the investigation in Mr. Massie's interest. A few extracts may here be useful:

"The troubles in the Central Prison, growing out of a belief among the Roman Catholic prisoners that Mr. Massie treats them with undue severity, still continue. The withdrawal of Rev. Father Jeffcot, the spiritual adviser of these prisoners, has naturally enough made matters worse. . . . The priest's resignation certainly lends colour to the stories told by the prisoners, but that is all. Mr. Jeffcot made no charge against Mr. Massie, nor, so far as we know, has His Grace Archbishop Lynch. It is pretty clear that one or both of them would have promptly demanded an investigation had there been any occasion for it."—(*Mail*, 13th March, 1885.)

"We have already referred on several occasions to the delay in beginning the investigation into the management of the Central Prison, which was ordered last session. Charges have been made that the delay was intended to allow a large number of prisoners to be discharged and dispersed, so that their evidence could not be obtained against the management.

"We publish this morning at some risk and acting under a sense of public duty, a letter from one of the promoters of the investigation. This letter is of such a character, so startling and shocking if true, so libellous and scandalous if false, that the Local Government dare not delay another twenty-

four hours the active commencement of the investigation. Our correspondent charges against the Warden cruelty, favouritism, discrimination against Roman Catholics, falsification of the records, concealment of facts, and bad management generally. It is needless to say that we would not undertake the publication of such a terrible letter if the writer of it were not a responsible man.”—(*Mail*, 23rd May, 1885.)

“The letter from the promoters of the Central Prison inquiry, which will be found elsewhere, contains charges of the gravest possible nature against the Warden of that institution. We are well aware that the letter contains material for a dozen libel suits against the *Mail*; nevertheless it is the bounden duty of a public journal to run the risks of actions-at-law when, as in this case, the public good demands it. It is almost unnecessary to say that we know nothing of the truth or falsity of the charges; but they are made by men of standing in the community, who profess to be able to prove them, and for that reason, and none other, we deem it our duty in the public interest to bring them to the notice of the Local Government. It is true a commission has been appointed to inquire into the multifarious accusations that have been levelled at Mr. Massie for a year past.

“The complainants are Roman Catholics. They assert that one of the prison guards (Guinness), who was until recently a Roman Catholic himself, is extremely prejudiced against Roman Catholic prisoners; and that Mr. Massie upholds him in all he does, in order to gratify certain visitors to the prison, who claim Guinness as their special *protégé* in religion. Furthermore, it is stated, though not by Roman Catholics, that this guard constantly displays a bitter *animus* against Protestant prisoners who do not belong to the particular denomination or school which he champions; and that here again he finds an all-powerful ally in the Warden. This is the general charge, and out of it the specific charges of cruelty and favouritism appear to have grown. Had the Legislature provided for paid chaplains to the prison, it is safe to say this very painful controversy would not have occurred. But in the absence of regular chaplains, visitors of various denominations, some clerical, others lay, attend to the spiritual wants of the inmates; and to the undue zeal of some of these persons the whole trouble appears to be due. Competition among Christian communions is very good in its way, but it is somewhat out of place when it takes the form of a rough-and-tumble combat over sinners who are supposed to be undergoing moral quarantine in a gaol. A fight over a corpse in a dead-house would not be more indecorous. Mr. Massie may have been weak enough to take sides in this *melée*, for he is neither a strong nor a prudent man; but we hesitate to believe that he has been guilty of the graver offences laid at his door by the promoters of the inquiry. They charge him in so many words with crimes near akin to murder. Putting aside the cases of the prisoners Linden, Mulholland and Mahony, and the dreadful allegations concerning the practices to which certain prisoners are sometimes compelled to resort, owing to the neglect or cruelty of the guards in not providing them with buckets, it is alleged that Mr. Massie starved a prisoner

named O'Neil until he became insane, and then falsified the prison records to hide the tragedy. The story is that O'Neil was confined in the dark cell for 72 hours, wearing irons for 43 of them; and that he was then placed in his own cell, and kept there without a bed, on a diet of bread and water, for 103 days. It is added that while the prison books show the amount of the dark cell punishment which O'Neil suffered, they contain no reference whatever to the three months' torture which destroyed his reason; and further, that Mr. Massie took no steps, as required by law, to have the prisoner formally declared insane by the County Judge, the inference being that he was afraid to produce his victim in court. It is impossible, as we have said, to believe that the Warden, or any other of his subordinates, could be guilty of so monstrous an outrage upon a fellow-creature; yet, on the other hand, our correspondents declare that they are ready with the proof. * * * Let the Commissioners open the investigation without further delay, and pursue it fearlessly. If Mr. Massie is innocent, and we hope and believe he is, it is only fair to him that the hideous charges that have been floating about so long, and have at last taken definite shape, should be sifted to the uttermost."—(*Mail*, 6th June, 1886.)

Speaking of the correspondents whose letters the *Mail* had published, the following statement is made:—

"Their only object in putting themselves to the immense trouble of preparing an indictment against him is to rescue human beings from inhuman treatment, as they believe. They say that they can prove every word that has been published in these columns concerning the internal economy of the prison, and the manner in which certain prisoners have been tortured, and the proofs they have laid before us certainly make out a strong *prima facie* case. They have also given us the names of responsible witnesses who are familiar with the facts, and who will be able and willing, as our correspondent believes, to substantiate each and every word of the charges, and we have confidence in the veracity and integrity of our correspondents, as they are gentlemen who occupy positions of no ordinary consequence, and who would not make these charges were they not actuated by most honourable and benevolent motives. The *Mail* has therefore deemed it to be its bounden duty to lay the whole case before the public, not with the view of injuring Mr. Massie, but in order that attention having been directed to the alleged abuses a thorough inquiry might be made without delay into a matter of such momentous importance to the community."—(*Mail*, 8th June, 1885.)

Up to this point, therefore, it is manifest that whatever had been done by either party to "squeeze out" the Warden, as the *Review* writer expresses it, was done by the Conservative party, and not by the Government. Now the Conservative press are charging us with an endeavour to "squeeze out" that officer; the *Presbyterian Review* has, under its Conservative manager, joined

in the cry; and some Presbyterian friends have been led to believe the false charge. The writer of the *Review* article expresses great anxiety to prevent the squeezing out of a Presbyterian Warden, though it should be at the expense of squeezing out a Presbyterian Premier. The Presbyterian Warden was in no danger of being squeezed out, but the Conservative party hope that, with the assistance of Conservative writers in the *Presbyterian Review*, there may be a chance of squeezing out the Presbyterian Premier.

EVENTS SUBSEQUENT TO COMMISSION.

The result of the investigation before the Commissioners was, to exonerate the Warden in regard to all that was serious in the charges against him; and from that time to this there has been no pressure on the Government, and no proposal or suggestion to the Government, from the Archbishop or any other quarter, that the Warden should be removed, either by being transferred to another office or in any other way. Whatever has led to a contrary supposition on the part of anyone, the fact is as I have stated.

The *Review* writer, in one of his articles, announced "on good authority," that "success is about to crown the efforts of the devout men who are so anxious that our public institutions shall be managed in their interest. The Government, it is said, has been convinced that 'Massie must go.' Of course they will give him an appointment somewhere else." This story was as unfounded as most others. The Government was never convinced that "Massie must go," and never contemplated removing him from the Wardenship or giving him an appointment somewhere else. No such suggestion was ever talked of amongst us, and I have the best reasons which the matter admits of for saying that no such suggestion was ever made otherwise to or by any of my colleagues. The whole story is the creation of some one's fancy or invention. The tone in which it is told by this writer has a wonderful similarity to party attacks on the Government. But the same article takes credit for the spirit in which it is written. "We are acting in no spirit of enmity to the Government. If we were enemies to it we should say nothing until the thing contemplated was done." Yet no such thing was contemplated, and if the writer had said nothing until the thing said to be in contemplation was done, we should have been spared all his articles. Enemies, according to his own showing, would have done better for us than the professed non-enemy, who, for the last three months has been doing what he could to destroy the good opinion entertained of us by our friends of the *Review* and by its Presbyterian readers.

In one of the *Review* articles, referring to pressure said to be brought by the Government "to bear upon Mr. Massie to retire from the Wardenship," the writer quotes this sentence from the *Tribune*, as confirming what the *Review* had said as to such pressure:—"We have heard it said that it was proposed to put Mr. Massie in another position, and that he did not like the change." Thus the *Tribune's* mention of a rumour is taken as a proof that the fact was as said to be rumoured. Now we are surely not responsible for rumours, and this rumour was as unfounded as many others are which get into newspapers. The *Review* writer does us this wrong, but he at the same time quotes the words of the *Tribune*. Mr. McLeod refers to the same matter, but, doing so from memory, he says that the *Tribune* "stated," that Mr. Massie had been offered and had declined another situation. It is hard to have Mr. McLeod thus treating as a positive statement against us what even the newspaper quoted from had mentioned as a rumour only, for which the editor did not pretend to vouch.

The same writer, in his article of the 5th August, speaking of the state of affairs since the Commissioners' report, says that the Warden was enduring "the insults of the spies that dogged his heels every day." He does not say who these spies were. We never heard of them. For rhetorical and, I am afraid, political effect, he has magnified the prison clerk, who was no spy, into a plurality of spies. I am able to say that the Warden never informed the Inspector, or the Provincial Secretary, or the Government, that he had received insults, and I have no doubt that he had received none. Insults to a superior officer we should never tolerate; and from what I am told of the prison clerk, his disposition and character, I believe that no one could be less likely than he to insult anyone. After the Commissioners' investigation no spies "dogged the Warden's heels;" and if there were such at an earlier period, they did their work secretly then, and discontinued it after the investigation had shown it to be useless. One of the principal spies of that former period was ascertained, on the investigation, to have been the convict whom the Warden had the misfortune himself to select to keep some of the prison books.

In a subsequent article the writer makes a reference to myself. While he disclaims being in the least degree influenced "by party feeling," he intimates that by his articles he has done the Premier of the Province good service, and that now, in consequence of these articles, the Government "feels the ground firmer under its feet," and says "No" to the supposed Roman Catholic demand for the Warden's dismissal. The demand was never made: the Government needed no firmer ground than it has had all along

for making no change in the Wardenship; and the good service which the *Review* writer has done for me is of a kind which my political enemies love and are grateful for, whatever I may myself think of such services.

THE PRISON CLERK.

The charge with respect to the appointment of the prison clerk is thus stated by the *Review* writer:—"The Government was induced to appoint a devout Roman Catholic as secretary to the Warden. The Warden declared, we understand, that there was nothing for this gentleman to do. The Government knew better. They were responsible for the management of the prison, and could not allow so worthy a Warden to be overworked, even though he was willing to sacrifice himself. Let us have plenty of officials. Let there be efficiency. Perish economy." In various articles the same writer pronounces Mr. Korman (the person referred to) the "nominee of the Archbishop," and the Archbishop's spy; says he has no hesitation in calling him the Archbishop's spy; declares as a matter of perfect certainty that Mr. Korman had been appointed "ostensibly" for legitimate purposes of the prison, "but in reality to be a spy on the Warden;" and he designates the Government's action in the matter as involving an "infamous system of priestly espionage." All these statements are untrue. Korman was not appointed to be secretary to the Warden; he was not the nominee of the Archbishop directly or indirectly; he was not the Archbishop's spy, or any one's spy; he was not appointed to be a spy on the Warden or anyone else. If a spy had been wanted, Korman was utterly unsuited for such an office, as I am told and believe, for I do not personally know him. He had been for some years a junior clerk in the office of the Provincial Secretary; and, the Commissioners having expressed a strong opinion that certain clerical work theretofore done by a convict should be done by a prison clerk, and the Government concurring in that view, the Provincial Secretary transferred Korman from the Parliament Buildings to the Central Prison, in order that as prison clerk he might do this work, with any other prison work which the Inspector should from time to time assign to him. This was the purpose for which he was really as well as ostensibly transferred to the Central Prison; and the Inspector informs me that Korman has ever since been doing the work thus intended.

I am able to say that no one had suggested to the Provincial Secretary that Korman should be appointed. The Provincial Secretary, on his own personal judgment, made the selection. Korman had been a faithful clerk, and was the most efficient of

his junior clerks who were available for transfer. He had had nothing to do with the agitation against the Warden, and there was no reason for supposing that he had been in sympathy with it. The *Review* writer suggests that Protestant voters should unite in "demanding that Government appointments should be made on the ground of fitness and without regard to the religious denomination of the person appointed." Is that rule to be acted upon only when it entitles a Protestant to get an appointment, and to be disregarded when it would give the appointment to a Catholic? When the transfer of Korman to the Central Prison was made, the Warden disliked the arrangement, and in strong terms expressed to the Inspector his dislike. I dare say that he did the same to others, and that some of his incautious words reached somehow the *Review* writer, as well as Mr. McLeod, Mr. Macdonnell, and yourself. His long controversy had made him suspicious of all Catholics. The Inspector thought that in his first interview with the Warden on the subject he had satisfied the Warden that the appointment had not been made in any unfriendly spirit, and that there was no reason why he should care though the clerk was a Roman Catholic. So the Inspector informs me, and he says that he had but one conversation on the subject with the Warden afterwards, and that this second conversation occurred months after the appointment. Subsequently to this second conversation the Warden renewed by letter, dated 30th August, his request for Korman's removal. I have ascertained that this letter he afterwards voluntarily withdrew, and now I understand he is content that Korman should remain; and up to this day he has found no fault with the way in which Korman has performed his duties or with his demeanour to himself, and has found nothing to confirm the notion of the young man being a spy, or playing in any way the part of a spy. The sole objection has been that he is a Roman Catholic.

In the temperate letter of Mr. Macdonnell, the propriety or duty of even now removing Korman from the Central Prison is strongly urged, on the ground of his creed, and of the Warden's objection to him on that account. The *Review* insists on the same thing, but in language the most offensive that the writer could command. Accepting as true what I have said as to how the clerk came to be appointed, and what his character and qualifications are, no thinking Protestant can fail to perceive that his removal on the simple ground of his creed would be a serious mistake.

The Warden of the Reformatory at Penetanguishene is a Roman Catholic; is he to be allowed to object to the appointment of a Protestant clerk, or even a Protestant deputy? The Mercer Reformatory has a Roman Catholic Matron; is she to be allowed

to object to the appointment of a Protestant assistant or deputy? It is quite probable that either would prefer a Roman Catholic deputy, though neither has hitherto made an objection to a Protestant; and a deputy has a much closer relation to the principal in each of these cases than a prison clerk has to the Warden. We did not dismiss the Warden when he was obnoxious to Roman Catholics; how could we cancel Korman's appointment on the sole ground that his creed made him for the time not agreeable to a Protestant Warden?

Every member of the Government, Protestant and Roman Catholic, has under him some officers of a different religious creed from his own.

So, when Reformers came into power in this Province almost all the officers of the Government were of another political party, and had been appointed on that very account. A not unreasonable apprehension was felt that some of them would be, or were, spies for the political friends from whom they had got their appointments; and it was disagreeable to have to work with officers in whose fidelity the Ministers had no confidence; but not one officer was discharged on that account, nor was his position in the public service changed. Many of them hold their offices still; and I am bound to say that I am not aware of an instance from that day to this in which any officer played the spy. A different policy would involve the adoption of the republican system, and every new Government would remove all officers not appointed by themselves. We had much more reason for our confidence in Mr. Korman than we had at first in some of the officials appointed by a preceding Government; and what in such cases Ministers have to do, the Warden of the Central Prison and all other like officers may have to do also. Besides, if we had rejected Korman or dismissed him from the prison because of his creed, the same reason would have required or justified the dismissal of all the other Roman Catholic officers in the prison; so far as has been discovered the mischief-makers had been some of the prisoners and of the ordinary prison guards.

CUR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

The *Review* writer claims to have shown "the determination of the Palace to subordinate our public institutions to its own interest and aggrandizement," and he calls on "Protestants in general and Presbyterians in particular," who by means of these articles now "see the danger that is impending, that they will make a determined stand against any further concessions to the Romish hierarchy." For himself he bravely announces his intention to do his share "to break the yoke of Roman Catholic domination

from the necks of the Dominion and the Province," and "to keep our public institutions free from the galling tyranny of Roman Catholic control."

In the *Review* of the 16th September the writer reiterates his former statements, and having manifest reference to them, uses the following language:—"Why should the *Globe* desire such exceptional favours to be granted to one denomination while the others are left to carry out their plans without such recognition? It might be a righteous retribution upon the cowardly politicians if the Protestant voters some day combined and refused their support to any Government that truckled at the Church of Rome," &c. This idea of getting all Protestants to unite politically is the present *role* of the *Mail*, adopted in the extremity of its party, and in the vain hope of thereby getting Protestant Liberals to leave their party and join with Conservatives at the coming elections, the practical result of which would merely be to give to Sir John Macdonald and his party, with all their misdeeds, a further lease of power, and to give my place to a lieutenant of that gentleman. As to my being a cowardly politician, the *Review* writer is the first who has ascribed to me that character; and as to truckling to the Church of Rome, I emphatically deny that there has been any truckling on the part of myself or of the Government of which I have been for fourteen years the head, and for all whose acts I am responsible. It has been my duty as a Premier in a mixed community, to be fair to that Church and to all Churches; and I have found it perfectly practicable to be fair to Roman Catholics without ceasing in principle or practice to be a Protestant and a Presbyterian. Without truckling to anybody, I have, to the best of my judgment, been fair to all, and no more than fair to Roman Catholics.

It is not true that, so far as the Provincial Government and Legislature are concerned, this Province has ever been under the "yoke of Roman Catholic domination," or under any other domination than that of the people of Ontario through their representatives. It is not true that any of the public institutions which belong to provincial management are under Roman Catholic "control," as the *Review* writer suggests. Is an institution to be regarded as under Roman Catholic control whenever the head of it is a Roman Catholic? Is it claimed that Roman Catholics should be held disqualified by their creed for the office of principal in any of our public institutions, however qualified otherwise they may be for the position? The Protestant members of the Government would be quite as averse to our institutions being under Roman Catholic control as the *Review* writer professes to be: and the Roman Catholic member of the Government, in the twelve years that he has been a Minister, has never indicated to us any desire

or thought of bringing about the domination or control against which the *Review* writer tells us he means to do his best.

Mr Macdonnell in his letter refers to some claim of the Church of Rome to "exceptional treatment;" and objects to the "interference of that church in our public affairs in a way which would not be tolerated if attempted by any Protestant Church." I should be glad to know what the exceptional treatment and the interference are to which Mr. Macdonnell had reference. The only institution which either he or the *Review* writer mentions is the Central Prison, and the only exceptional treatment or interference specified has reference to that institution.

BOYS' REFORMATORY, PENETANGUSHENE.

My attention has been called to an article in the *Mail*, which is more specific. It speaks of my assenting to a "policy that is placing the Roman Catholic Church in possession of those public institutions, like the Boys' Reformatory at Penetanguishene and the Mercer Reformatory of this city, where proselytizing is to be done." I have already said that there is no proselytizing by Catholics or Protestants in our public institutions. The reformatory at Penetanguishene has a Roman Catholic for a Warden, and so it has had since 1859, when the institution was established. The Warden then appointed held office until 1879, when a change was made in consequence of the desire of the Government to introduce certain modern improvements to which the old Warden was opposed. This institution has always had two paid chaplains, one a Protestant and one a Roman Catholic, who give their whole time to the institution, and it is the only provincial institution which has had such officers. I have never heard of any attempt at proselytism in this institution, and I believe there has always been harmony in it between the Protestants and Catholics.

MERCER REFORMATORY.

With respect to the Mercer Reformatory, Mrs. O'Reilly, the Matron, is the widow of the late James O'Reilly, Q.C., of Kingston, and she was appointed on the strong recommendation of Protestants in that city irrespective of party. The deputy-matron is a Protestant; and the person in charge of the Refuge, where the young girls are, is also a Protestant. On the other hand, Protestants are at the head of the Toronto, London, Hamilton, Kingston, and Orillia asylums, the Blind Institute at Brantford, and the Deaf and Dumb Institute at Belleville; all have been appointed by the present government; and although the principal officer in each is a Protestant, the officer next in position is a Protestant also; and so it is in the case of the Central Prison. I

is to be remembered that the temporary want of harmony in the Central Prison was exceptional, and has not extended to any of our other institutions.

AID TO HOSPITALS AND CHARITIES.

The *Mail* newspaper has said that, of the additional sum now annually voted for hospitals and charities, beyond the amount voted in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time, a disproportionate part goes to Roman Catholic institutions; and other Conservatives have been asserting the same thing. Does what is said in the letters about undue influence and exceptional treatment refer to this? I can hardly think so. The facts on that subject are these, and they show beyond all cavil the reverse of exceptional treatment in favour of Roman Catholics. Soon after coming into office the present Government decided that the grants for charitable objects, instead of being determined from year to year by the discretion of the Government, might and should be regulated by some system, and the chance or suspicion of partiality be thereby removed. An Act was passed for this purpose in 1874 (cap. 33). It was entitled "An Act to regulate public aid to charitable institutions." It recited as follows:—"Whereas it is desirable and expedient that all appropriations from the public funds in aid of charitable institutions should be upon some properly arranged and equitable system, and that municipal and other corporations should be stimulated and encouraged to give a liberal support to such institutions." The Act then provides for giving a certain sum per day for every person aided in the institution; and a certain further sum per day on condition that this further sum should not exceed in any year one-fourth of the money received by the institution from all sources other than the province, towards the ordinary yearly maintenance of the institution. In carrying out the Act the Government Inspector makes a personal inspection of all institutions receiving public aid, and also procures sworn statements as to the number of persons maintained by every such institution during the year, calculates what each institution is entitled to on the basis set forth in the statute, reports the result, and the appropriation taken is of the aggregate amount which the institutions are reported by him to be entitled to receive under the Act. Both the inspectors are Protestants, and one of the two is a Presbyterian. This Act is now embodied in the Revised Statutes, cap. 223. It is by this law that our appropriations are regulated.

If, therefore, of the increased vote since Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time the Roman Catholic institutions are now receiving more than others, it is either because the increase in the number

of persons aided in these institutions is greater, or because Roman Catholics have been more liberal in contributing to the maintenance of their institutions than the supporters of other institutions have been.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

The *Review* writer further states that "in Ontario, with a Government and legislation permitting the school system to be yearly encroached upon it is about time that some one should speak out." The letters do not mention this yearly encroachment on our school system. There has been no encroachment. Amendments have, from time to time, been made in the Public School Law for its improvement. But amendment or improvement is not encroachment. If the writer's reference is to Separate Schools, then I have to state that, instead of there having been yearly encroachments upon the School law by Separate School legislation, the fact is there was no amendment whatever from the session of 1871-2, when the Reform Government came into power, until the session of 1879, and none after the session of 1879 [with the exception of a declaratory section in 1881] until the session of 1884. The amendments made were such as seemed to us all to be fair and reasonable; and such also as we all thought would be approved of by the Protestant community of all parties (now that Separate Schools have by the B. N. A. Act become by general consent a part of our educational system). Since the amendments of 1879 there have been two general elections without objection having been taken to these amendments from any quarter, so far as I remember; and on both occasions the Government was sustained in spite of the united efforts of the Dominion Government and the Local Opposition. So, in regard to the subsequent amendments, no objection to them was made in the House, none by any of the religious journals of the province, and none from any other quarter. The only changes which the Legislature has made in the Separate School law have thus been changes which were acquiesced in by all Protestants at the time, and were not objected to until now, when a No Popery cry is if possible to be worked up for political purposes.

Following in the same direction as the *Review* writer, the *Mail* has been a little more specific. That journal has said that in our legislation we have "conferred on Roman Catholics distinct and extraordinary advantages over the supporters of Public Schools as regards State aid and other matters." And this is another misstatement pure and simple. By express law, State aid to both Public and Separate Schools is according to the school attendance, and no Roman Catholic is exempt from school rates any more than a Protestant is.

The Separate School law is not of our creation. It was on the statute book at the time of Confederation, and it provides for separate schools for Protestants and for coloured people, as well as for Roman Catholics. Personally, I should be glad if the children of all denominations could be educated together. But some will have Separate Schools, and the making of some provision for them by law was defended by Dr. Ryerson when he was Chief Superintendent of Education. In common with many Protestants he regarded these schools either as unavoidable, or as doing less harm than, in smoothing the working of our school system, they did good. There were other Protestants who did not perceive, or did not at first perceive, either the necessity or the policy of having Separate Schools, and when these schools had to be sustained by Lower Canada votes the fact was specially irritating. The agitation against them, however, though for years kept up with vigour, was not successful, and when the scheme for confederating the provinces was under discussion, and our local affairs were to be left to our own control in the Province, any danger of encroachments by Roman Catholics against the Protestant sentiment of the country was so effectually removed that Mr. Brown, who had been the great opponent of Separate Schools, and whose journal was the "fearless exponent of Protestantism" according to the *Review* writer, felt it his duty to acquiesce in the continuance of these schools on certain conditions set forth afterwards in the B. N. A. Act. That Act provides that the power of a Provincial Legislature to pass laws was to be subject to the following among other restrictions:—

"Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the Union. All the powers, privileges, and duties of the Union, by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the Separate Schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are, hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec."

Separate Schools in Upper and Lower Canada thus became by general consent a permanent part of the educational system of the two provinces. The Separate School law of Upper Canada, at the time of the Union, exempted the supporters of Roman Catholic Separate Schools from paying a school rate for the Public Schools. It provided, amongst other things, that every Separate School should share in the Legislative Public School grant, and in all other public grants, investments, and allotments for Public School purposes, now made or thereafter to be made by the Province or the municipal authorities (not including local as-

assessments for Public School purposes) according to the average attendance at the respective schools; and the trustees of Separate Schools had "power to impose, levy, and collect school rates or subscriptions upon and from persons sending children to or subscribing towards the support of such schools, and . . . all the powers in respect to Separate Schools that the trustees of Public Schools have," &c.

In a conversation which I recently had with an ardent Protestant, an objection was made to the two inspectors of Separate Schools being paid out of the Provincial Treasury; and I may refer here to this objection. By the law as it stood at the time of Confederation, these schools were subject to such inspection as the Chief Superintendent (now the Minister of Education) should direct, and the Government inspection of these schools was by the paid officers of the Province. The duty was then performed by the High School Inspectors. The duties of these inspectors having increased from year to year, and having become at length too great to be performed, the Minister of Education found it necessary to transfer the inspection of Separate Schools to distinct officers. Two Separate School Inspectors were therefore provided for, to be appointed by the Government, and paid in the same manner as High School Inspectors. The salaries and expenses of the two Separate School Inspectors amount together to about \$4,000. Now there are fifty-eight County Public School Inspectors; they are appointed by the County Councils; and one-half of their salaries is paid by the Province, making in all \$30,096. More than that amount is paid in addition out of county rates to which the supporters of Separate Schools contribute. As we have Separate Schools, it is in the general interest that they should be subject to Government inspection; and thoughtful Protestants will feel that the cost is nothing as compared with the advantage.

My attention has been called to the following statement in a recent number of a Conservative newspaper, and I am told that a like statement has been made in other journals of the same party:—"One thing we know is sought, that the law shall compel every Catholic living in a Separate School district to pay his school tax to the Separate School Trustees whether he will or not." If this is so, the gentlemen who make the announcement must be in the confidence of the Roman Catholic clergy in a way that I am not. No such desire has ever been hinted to myself; nor to my colleagues, as they inform me. But the story, I have no doubt, is a mere invention.

GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE.

Again, some have the notion that Roman Catholics get more

than a fair share of public offices ; but it is not so. No Government ever existed in any Province in Canada which ignored the fact that a large section of its population are Roman Catholics, or which in its appointments had no reference to that fact. I should be glad if I were at liberty in every case to weigh the claims and merits of candidates for every appointment as if all were Protestants or all Catholics ; but it is not always practicable to do so ; and no wise statesman, therefore, will lay down an absolute rule to that effect. Not being able to always exclude from consideration the religious element, our rule is to see that Roman Catholics get a due share of Provincial appointments, and not more than a due share, regard being had to efficiency, and to local considerations and personal claims. The Roman Catholic organ of the Conservative party has frequently attacked us on the ground that we do not give to Roman Catholics more offices than they have received. But that they have not had more than their share will be manifest when I tell you that there are in the Province forty sheriffs, and so far as I know but one of these is a Roman Catholic. There are thirty-nine county attorneys, and so far as I know but three of these are Roman Catholics. There are sixty-one registrars of deeds, and as far as I know only five are Roman Catholics. On the other hand, taking into account all appointments in the gift of the Provincial Government, not local in their character, and to which local considerations do not apply, the Roman Catholics, having reference to the financial value of the appointments, have their fair share, and not more than their fair share.

CAUSE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S STRENGTH.

In the *Review* of the 7th October, the writer adds another false charge against me, which I have not observed in any previous number of the *Review*. In evident reference to the Ontario Government, though not in language expressly confined to it, he says that "the moral and material interests of our country are alike sacrificed to the demands of party," and he charges us with a determination to secure "the Catholic vote at all hazards ; the history of our Governments," he says, "has been that of surrender to the demands of the representatives of the Papacy."

It is not true that the moral and material interests of our country have by the present Ontario Government been sacrificed to party. The favour with which the Provincial Government is regarded in the country, and by non-partizan Conservatives as well as by Reformers, is because we have been doing, and are known to have been doing, all we could to advance the moral and material interests of the country ; and our efforts for this purpose

have not been unsuccessful, as has been demonstrated in many a debate and on many a platform, and as our newspaper friends in every part of the Province have often demonstrated in their journals. Our record in this respect has always been our only strength. We have not had the means, nor the inclination either, to entrench ourselves by bribing the people's representatives, or by bribing purchasable electors. It is not true that it has ever been our determination to secure "the Catholic vote at all hazards." It is not true that we have made any "surrender to the demands of the representative of the Papacy." We have done nothing for Roman Catholics to which Roman Catholics were not justly entitled, and which it was not in accordance with the Protestant sentiment of the community that they should receive.

Another article in the same number of the *Review* has partyism for its subject. The writer says that "as things are at present, good men are afraid to offer to serve their country, and if they did offer they would likely be defeated by the party machine." So that we have no good men in public life. I am sure you do not endorse that slander; nor does Mr. McLeod or Mr. Macdonnell. There are bad men in public life, as there are in every walk of private life; but there are among the Liberal members of the House of Commons and of the Ontario Assembly whom I know, good men who stand as high in the estimation of their respective churches as the *Review* writer, whoever he is, can claim to do; and I can say further that, among the people's representatives with whom I have had to do, there has always been as large a proportion of good men as in any literary, professional, commercial, or other public body not of a specifically religious character. If the *Review* writer has not met with good men amongst the public men he has known, I am sorry that his acquaintance with public men has been confined to the worst class.

WHY ROMAN CATHOLICS SUPPORT THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT.

I believe that the apprehensions of some have been excited by the mere circumstance being dwelt upon of the Archbishop being friendly to the present Government, or by that circumstance in connection with others. As a Liberal leader, I am glad that he is friendly to us. I am glad of the support we receive from all quarters. I am glad to know that His Grace has always been friendly to us; and who doubts that nothing would better please those Conservatives who are trying to raise a No Popery cry than to get all Roman Catholics, bishops, priests, and laymen, to give their support to the Conservative party? Who doubts that we should then hear nothing more from our opponents about No

Popery? The more Popery the better would then be the Conservative sentiment.

But whatever political advantage we may receive from the good-will of Roman Catholics, whether clergy or laity, we shall not owe to any unequal rights or privileges obtained by their Church or people at our hands, for they have obtained none; nor do we owe their good-will to any condition, promise, or understanding in regard to the future, for there has been no such condition, promise, or understanding. With the light of my official experience, I have always thought that as observant churchmen the Roman Catholics, bishops, clergy, or laity, do not expect any unequal privileges and advantages in a Province where their people number but one-sixth of the population.

Since Confederation no religious question has divided political parties in Ontario; and, outside of religious questions, Protestants and Catholics have the same interest in good government. I have no ground for doubting that one principal reason why any of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy desire the success of the present Ontario Government is that, in common with (I hope and believe) the majority of the Protestant clergy, they believe the present Ontario Government to be a good Government; they believe that we have governed well in the past, and that we may be relied on for governing well in the future. The Roman Catholic newspapers which are friendly to us, have, when referring to the Government, been in the habit of commending it in that sense. Thus the last number of the *Canadian Freeman*, a Roman Catholic journal published in Kingston, tells its readers that "the chief reason why the present Ontario Government has been again and again returned to office is, that it is a prudent and honest Government in the management of the finances of the Province." An examination of the files of that journal, and of other journals of the same character, would no doubt supply many like examples.

If the friendliness of the Archbishop, or of any of the bishops or priests, has any additional reason applicable to Roman Catholics specially, I believe that additional reason is to be found in the fact that in most parts of the Province Orangemen are the backbone of the Conservative party. You observe in your letter that their methods are "unnecessarily irritating to Roman Catholics," and that they "go out of their way to bring trouble out of the feuds of the past." When no question between Protestants and Catholics is at issue, it is not unnatural that Catholics should be found gradually withdrawing from a party in which Orangeism is so prominent.

It is further to be remembered that in the old land Irish Catholics have generally belonged to the Liberal party. So, in

the former Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada Roman Catholics were Liberals; and after the Union they continued to be Liberals under Mr. Baldwin and Sir Francis Hincks, and until the coalition of 1854 introduced confusion into the political affairs of the Province. It is surely not unnatural—the reasons which separated them for a time from the Liberal party being at an end since Confederation—that they should be found gradually returning to the party to which they have generally belonged in Ireland, and to which they belonged for so many years here.

If we are to have an increased number of Roman Catholic supporters at the approaching elections, it is quite certain that we are not to have the support of all. The Hon. Frank Smith is still in the Cabinet of Sir John Macdonald as a representative of the Roman Catholics of Ontario; and other prominent Roman Catholics of this city are still avowed and active Conservatives. The *Irish Canadian* and its proprietors are Conservative. That journal in a recent number announced frankly that if by means of a No Popery cry the Reformers should be displaced the *Irish Canadian* will not complain. Its hostility to the Liberal party is so great that its managers are glad to have us beaten even by a No Popery cry.

In view of the considerations which I have set forth, and of the personal statements which I have made, a little reflection will convince my friends that the fact of an increased number of Roman Catholic voters purposing to support our candidates at the next election does not afford any good reason for alarm on account of Protestant interests, or for apprehension about our civil and religious liberties.

THE REV. MR. M'LEOD'S LETTER.

Of the three letters, Mr. McLeod's is the hardest for a Presbyterian layman to bear who has been endeavouring to do his duty, and whose endeavours have hitherto met with acceptance from his fellow-Presbyterians as well as others; for Mr. McLeod repeats, and evidently believes, several of the untrue things which the *Review* articles contained, and which are not mentioned by Mr. Macdonnell or yourself, though Mr. McLeod mentions them (as I have already acknowledged) without the virulence which the *Review* articles display. I presume that in sanctioning the insertion of those articles in the *Review*, if he had anything to do with their insertion, he did so from that general concurrence in some of their statements which appears from his letter, and without perceiving the political bias and personal animus running through the articles.

Mr. McLeod gives publicity to a rumour, which I have never seen or heard elsewhere, and which he refers to as if he believed it also might be true, viz. : that a member of the Government had "breathed out threatening and slaughter upon all Presbyterians after the next election." Now, it does seem to me that anyone who could believe that rumour must, for the time, have been in a state of mind to believe anything against us. As head of the Government I should have to be a consenting party to the "slaughter." I am myself a Presbyterian, by birth, education, and choice, and an older Presbyterian than Mr. McLeod himself. One of my colleagues also is a Presbyterian. Presbyterians have always been and still are amongst our strongest supporters and warmest friends. Mr. Fraser, the only Roman Catholic member of the Government, is, I suppose, the member referred to by Mr. McLeod. Like the rest of us, he has always had, and still has, the political support and personal friendship of the great majority of the Presbyterians of his Riding, where he has lived all his life; and he has many relatives who are Presbyterians. Independently of all this, no man is less likely than Mr. Fraser to talk such nonsense as Mr. McLeod's informant has ascribed to him. I may say here that I have never heard from Mr. Fraser, or any of my colleagues, one word of unfriendliness or disrespect towards Presbyterians, and I have heard from them all many words of gratitude and confidence. It would have been very strange if it were otherwise; without the confidence and active support of Presbyterian electors, in common with those of other Protestants, the Liberal party would cease to exist.

If it is said, that so far as concerns me personally, the facts may be as I have stated, but that I have spoken in this letter for my colleagues also, and that I cannot know what has been said to or by them, bearing on the charge of injurious Romish influence; to this objection let me say that, where in this letter I have spoken for the whole Government, I have done so because I have learned from my colleagues the facts which I do not know personally, and because my experience of them all, ever since we have been colleagues, enables me to place implicit reliance on any statement which they make to me, for not one of them has ever deceived me yet.

I wish that before Mr. McLeod permitted himself to believe us all given over to Rome, and to dishonesty and double-dealing and everything bad for the sake of Rome, it had occurred to him to communicate with me in order to receive and to consider my version of matters. There would have been a special propriety in taking this course, where two of the persons to be condemned unheard were members of his own church (not of his congregation), and of his own political party, occupying prominent places

in the Province, and residing in the same city as himself; but I must now content myself with remembering that any man, however great his ability and pure his heart, may sometimes be wrong and unjust. I hope to find that Mr. McLeod has not allowed himself to form too strong an opinion to be overcome by a plain statement from me of the facts within my knowledge, and by a renewed consideration of the matter by himself in the light of that statement.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

What I have said ought, I think, to convince you all that the attacks on the Ontario Government have been occasioned by mistake and misapprehension; and if any are still unconvinced, I would remind the still doubting friends that there is a time and a place for everything, and that no intelligent man who knows anything of Canadian history supposes, or can suppose, that religion, or civil and religious liberty, is safer with the Conservative party of this country or its chiefs, than with the Liberal party and its leaders and representatives. The history of the two parties for the last thirty years would make any such supposition not absurd merely, but ludicrous. The *Presbyterian Review* should not be allowed to play into the hands of the Conservative party.

It has been my duty to point out some errors into which your two brother clergymen and yourself have been led by information partly defective and partly false, but I continue to hold you and them in the high esteem and respect which are your due as faithful and successful ministers of the Church to which we all belong and which we all love.

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,

O. MOWAT.

